

DAYLIGHT

Creation Science for Catholics

Patrons

St. Thomas Aquinas [March]

St. Michael [Sept.]

St. Bonaventure [July] The Immaculate Conception [Dec.]

Number 15

Contents

Spring 1995

Editorial and News	2
Jesus Christ and Evolution <i>J.V. Collyer</i>	3
Editorial comment	4
Theistic Evolution and Vatican Council I	
<i>Fr. David R. Becker</i>	5
Can Theistic Evolution be Taught ?	
<i>John G. Campbell</i>	8
Scientists Opposed to Evolution	14
Pontifical Biblical Commission	16
The Origins Debate: The Need For The Catholic	
Origins Society <i>G.J. Keane</i>	19
Creation, Lawlessness, and World Government	
<i>Ellen Myers</i>	30
"Telegraphology"	34
What is 'DAYLIGHT' ?	36

---ooOoo---

Honorary Member

Professor Maciej Giertych, B.A., M.A. (Oxon), Ph.D., D.Sc.

Secretary and Editor

Anthony L.G. Nevard B.Sc.

19 Francis Avenue, St. Albans, Herts AL3 6BL, England.

EDITORIAL

Over recent years, there has been an increased interest in Creation Science among the Catholics of Ireland, which has now resulted in the formation of the **IRISH CATHOLIC ORIGINS SOCIETY**. The inaugural meeting was held in Buswell's Hotel, Dublin on Sunday 11 June 1995, and addressed by the two founder-members: Dr. Patrick Gill, who spoke on 'Our Lady and Evolution', and Mr. Redmond O'Hanlon, who described 'Galileo's Legacy'. The talks were very well received, and we congratulate the founders on this enterprise, recommending them to your prayers and support.

Contact: Redmond O'Hanlon, 82 Braemor Road, Churchtown, Dublin 14, Ireland. Tel. 298 2112.

'The Christian Democrat' paper of April '95 included a very good review by Derek Hall of the video 'Evolution- Fact or Belief?', which resulted in the sale of 13 copies. Congratulations and thanks to them for this valuable publicity, and to Mr. and Mrs. Cockburn for initiating this venture.

Miss Roslyn Nothnagel - one of our earliest supporters - sadly passed away on February 11, 1995. Roslyn regularly attended our London meetings, and was a charming and gracious lady, who will be much missed. R.I.P.

Stock list update. Please add to the list printed on p.32 of **DAYLIGHT** #13 the following items:

THE HOLY SHROUD- "It's the Standard of our Salvation"

CRC Special Number, March/April 1991.

£2.50

STONES AND BONES - Carl Wieland.

Readable and attractive overview of the main issues from scientific, logical and (Biblical) Christian position.

£1.25

Prices include postage in the UK only.

Subscriptions. Most have been renewed - many thanks! UK rate continues at £5 ; Europe = £7 ; World = £10 .

Details were last given on p.28 of **DAYLIGHT** # 12.

A.N.

JESUS CHRIST AND EVOLUTION

John V. Collyer

Those Christians who think that evolution is a modern scientific 'fact' should think again, because there were already several theories of evolution long before Jesus was born. If any of them had been a scientific fact, then the all-knowing Son of God would have been aware of the fact. However, when Jesus taught his disciples about the origin of the human marriage relationship, He said quite plainly, "from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female." (Mark 10:6). Confirming this information, when the inspired gospel writer Luke listed the ancestry of Jesus, he traced it down to "Adam who was of God" (Luke 3:38). Thus the Christian finds the Genesis account of creation confirmed by no less than Jesus Himself, and His disciple Luke.

In this modern scientific age, we must ask ourselves: "Was Jesus deceived by the Jewish 'myth' of divine creation, as found in the first chapters of Genesis ? Or are modern Christians deceived when they adopt the theory of evolution?"

It is not widely realised that theories of evolution date back to centuries before Jesus was born. One of the centres of ancient Greek learning and philosophy was the city of Miletus in Asia Minor. It was here that ancient Greek philosophy was founded in about 600 BC by Thales, one of the seven sages. His theory was that life began in the oceans, but he knew not how. He was followed by Anaximander, also of Miletus, who thought that the action of the Sun on mud had caused life to evolve. Yet another theory emanated from Miletus, when Anaximenes propounded that, as the air was always in motion, life had originated in air.

The "Great World System" and the theory of "Atomism", details of which are not known, emanated from Leucippus of Miletus, to be followed by the theory of "Fossil evolution" put forward by Xenophanes, and "Aerial evolution" suggested

by Diogenes, the Greek philosopher who is better known for having lived in a tub. Yet more theories of evolution were propounded by Greek and Roman philosophers before Jesus arrived on the scene. But Jesus was not seduced by these pagan philosophies, and confirmed His faith in the Old Testament writings by quoting them freely.

The theory of evolution came to public notice again in the 17th century when the French philosopher Rene Descartes sowed doubts in the minds of a public who were woefully ignorant of the Bible. Since then, over 70 theories of evolution have been seriously promulgated, many of them commencing by pointing out the short-comings of earlier theories. There is therefore no 'fact' of evolution. Jesus Christ's simple statement is still the truth of Man's beginning.

oooOooo

Many readers will recall Mr. Collyer's list of 50 theories of evolution, published in **DAYLIGHT #7**, March 1993. Because evolutionists agree that evolution definitely happened, they call it a **fact**, despite wide disagreement about **how** it occurred and its **causes**. The scientific and educational 'establishment' may tolerate debate on the latter, but shun any member who questions the **fact**. Cases of discrimination, even dismissals, against such courageous people continue to occur, even involving Catholic institutions, which must remain nameless at present.

oooOooo

Several members drew my attention to the Editorial in **FAITH**, May/June 1995, defending its promotion of theistic evolution, and quoting Popes Pius XII and John Paul II. While agreeing that their **personal opinions** seem to concur with the prevailing evolutionary viewpoint, we respectfully suggest that, in the light of current scientific **knowledge**, they could be mistaken (as I was until 1977). We maintain that Catholics should be fully informed of the facts **against** evolution, as belief in it has frequently destroyed Christian faith. We do not question the sincerity of the **FAITH** supporters, but hope that those who believe that 'Catholic creationists' [aren't we all?] should have a fair hearing, will read at least this issue of **DAYLIGHT**. With its emphasis on Theistic Evolution, I dedicate it to them !

Ed.

THEISTIC EVOLUTION AND VATICAN COUNCIL I

Fr. David R. Becker

There is an opinion abroad in the Church that one can be fully Catholic and at the same time believe in theistic evolution. As one who disagrees with that opinion I have been giving some thought to the question of which Church dogma theistic evolution contradicts, and it seems to me that theistic evolution contradicts the teaching of Vatican Council I on what has been variously called "natural theology" or "theodicy", specifically the capacity of human reason to discover the existences of God through study of "those things that have been made (*ea quae facta sunt*)."

Vatican I stated: *If anyone should say, the one and true God, our Creator and Lord, through those things that have been made, by the light of natural human reason cannot be certainly known, anathema sit.* (Sess. III, Canones de Revelatione, #1). The Council was echoing the teaching of the Apostle Paul in Romans 1:19-20, that people can come to know God through their human reason by reflecting on *ea quae facta sunt*, those things that have been made: *Whatsoever can be known about God is clear to them; he himself made it so. Since the creation of the world, invisible realities, God's eternal power and divinity, have become visible, recognised through the things he has made.*

Now the Church has always exhorted her sons and daughters to "*sentire cum Ecclesia*," i.e. to THINK WITH THE CHURCH! But theistic evolutionists, in my perception, say, "I will BELIEVE with the Church, but I will THINK with the world; I will give my heart to the Church, but I will give my head to the philosophy of scientific naturalism and its theory of evolution. Thus theistic evolution precipitates a psychological split within a person between head and heart, intellect and will, reason and faith. The split is reminiscent of the psychological split experienced by people in the Middle Ages who tried to give their minds to the "new knowledge" of Aristotelian science and philosophy, and their hearts to the Catholic Faith, and who tried to legitimize

their stance by upholding the doctrine of the "Double Truth". The Church rejected that doctrine noting that it violated the principle of non-contradiction: *A thing cannot be and not be at the same time in the same way.*

The theistic evolutionist, in my perception, adopts a radically Protestant position by holding that the sole basis for divine faith in God the Creator is revelation, i.e. the Bible. The theistic evolutionist then usually proceeds to saw off this branch he is sitting on by carrying out a radical "demythologization" of Scripture in the interest of accommodating the theory of evolution into the Christian worldview. By accommodating the evolutionistic notions of polygenism (many "original" couples) and humans being born from apes, Adam and Eve become mere symbols of the many primordial human couples, and their direct creation as adults by God is dismissed, replaced by speculations that Adam and Eve were feral children, something like Romulus and Remus, suckled and reared not by wolves but by apes. History shows that when people begin to regard the Bible as merely human literature, or in James Hutton's phrase "questionable Jewish records", and proceed to engage in radical reinterpretations of Gen.1-11 in the interest of harmonizing the biblical story of origins with the world's cosmogenic myth of evolution, it is not long before they abandon the Christian faith altogether. We can see the paradigm of this spiritual decline in the life of Charles Darwin himself, who began as a divinity student and ended an atheist.

As regards human reason, the theistic evolutionist, in my perception, "buys into" the dominant philosophy of our time, scientific naturalism and its theory of evolution, and with his intellect essentially agrees with the atheistic evolutionists who say, 'Study the phenomena of nature however you will, you will not find any evidence of God.' The theistic evolutionist finds himself a dissenter from those who argue that the phenomena of nature give evidence of a Designer, and he rejects both the classical arguments from design, as articulated by William Paley in 1802, and the modern-day arguments from design articulated by Dean

Kenyon and others [i.e. anti-evolutionists -Ed.]. Rejecting Paley's "Watchmaker", they support Richard Dawkins' "Blind Watchmaker", natural selection, as the mechanism that produces all the wonders of the biosphere that once were attributed to Almighty God.

Now consider the plight of the theistic evolutionist. As regards human reason, he no longer believes with Vatican I that reason can discover the existence of God by reflecting on the phenomena of nature. As regards faith in God, he sees that as dependent on revelation from God, as expressed in the Bible. But he has come to see the Bible not as the inspired word of God, whose primary author is God Himself, who guarantees the truth and reliability of its contents, but merely as human literature produced by primitive, unevolved minds.

At this point the theistic evolutionist, having rejected the biblical story of origins in favour of the world's cosmogenic myth of evolution, faces the problem of what to do with Scripture. A common solution these days is to say that Scripture has nothing to say about our origins, Gen.1-11 is really not a story of our origins, but merely a Mosaic diatribe about observance of the Sabbath. This solution may work in the short run to relieve cognitive dissonance in the theistic evolutionist, but it evacuates Scripture of any profound significance. The faithful in the Church look to the Bible to provide a meaningful worldview, and a satisfactory account of our origins. If it can provide neither, it really ought to be jettisoned.

The theistic evolutionist will find himself asking, "If scientific naturalism and evolution are really true, and the Bible's claim to be the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God, authored by God Himself for our instruction can scarcely be taken seriously, why do I cling to the Church and its Creed, and to belief in the Creator?" If the answer is merely, "Tracing the expanding universe back in time we find there is a convergence to a beginning which we call the Big Bang, and something or Someone must be responsible for that beginning!"- I suggest that, perhaps, he has become a Deist. The next question for his meditation then is, "In what authentic sense am I still a Christian or a Catholic?"

CAN THEISTIC EVOLUTION BE TAUGHT ?

John G. Campbell
(d.1986)

[First published in **DAYLIGHT**, June 1979]

Reports indicate that a certain attitude is still in vogue, that which is summarised in the statement - "Does it really matter if the Evolutionist approach is permitted, or even inculcated, as long as God is presented as being behind the process?" In short, it is the tenacious business of Theistic Evolution, an attitude developed under the illusion that the rejection of Evolution means going against the findings of modern science.

This modern science aspect is the first pitfall in the teaching of Theistic Evolution. For, unfortunately, practically all the little Catholic pamphlets from this viewpoint inform the pupils that Evolution is accepted by "all the scientists". It is at once obvious that the clerical authors of these works are very much amateurs in the subject, but the recipients of the general message of the media: for any course of intensive reading in the subject would show that many scientists of world-wide fame, such as Lord Kelvin, Vialleton, etc.,etc. have taken the trouble to publish works declaring that Evolution is contrary to the findings of their respective sciences. * This continuous theme - that all the scientists accept Evolution - is perhaps the most serious suppression of fact of all these suppressions of the modern media. And is it not a very serious business to begin the religious education of the child upon the basis of a current falsehood ?

Moreover, there is the general fallacy contained in this approach, that is, that Eternal Truth (or at least its immemorial presentation) is something that is subject to the scientific opinions of any one age. Let there be remembered here the old adage - 'The science of today is the laughing-stock of tomorrow'. Yes, one could give quite a few examples of scientific opinions once held but now rejected. It is a dangerous fallacy to present a theology which has as its basis the scientific declarations of the secular scientists.

However, the main difficulty in the presentation of an Evolution-based religious education lies in the difficulty of interpreting it in the light of the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith.

Certainly the most fundamental of these fundamentals are: the direct creation of the human soul by God, i.e. not evolved from any animal;

that Adam and Eve were the First Parents of all men;

that there came The Fall of our First Parents, by which the taint of Original Sin was passed on to all their posterity.

Without these fundamentals, any talk of Redemption by Jesus Christ becomes quite meaningless. Therefore, can these fundamentals of the Faith be reconciled with the Evolution postulate ?

The human soul.

Evolution holds that the whole human person evolved from the animal, and Darwin himself insisted that man was solely of the animal kind. It is at once obvious that no Catholic can hold this view, that of classical Evolution. But has Theistic Evolution any way out of this Evolutionist dilemma for the Catholic ?

The answer of Theistic Evolution is that the body of man evolved from the animal, but that the soul was directly created by God (though some Theistic Evolutionists qualify this by implying that the mind of man was evolved!) But this solution at once confronts us with formidable obstacles. Is it not the soul that gives form to the body ? Thus, how can one picture the monkey body evolving into a human body whilst the monkey soul remains, evolving into a human body with the brain cells and the nerve motors and extensions meant to be animated by the human soul - indeed, physiologically is not this an impossibility ? Already, the attempted reconciliation of the direct creation of the human soul with the Evolution postulate lands us in deep water.

But assuming his very unusual evolved body was possible, in what way was the creation of the human soul accomplished? We might say that it was accomplished in an adult animal body. But then, that animal body already possesses its own animal soul, which means that God would have to terminate that animal life and replace it with that of a human soul -

that is to say, **the creation of man from an animal corpse !**
This is not a solution that many would regard as fitting,

and, indeed, in view of all this, what possible objections can there be to the direct creation of man from "the dust of the earth"?

There remains the solution of the direct creation of the human soul in the animal body at the moment of conception. But this would mean that the new human being would have to gain its human development in the midst of a family of animal brothers and sisters. Then as manhood was gained, this Adam would encounter his Eve, created by the same method, the pair taking up house together and becoming the first parents of the human race.

These are the questions that inevitably arise in the attempt to reconcile the direct creation of the human soul with the Evolutionist teaching. And if anyone thinks that the students do not realise the contradictions in this approach, then he is grievously mistaken.

Adam and Eve.

The Catholic is bound to believe that all men are descended from the common First Parents whose Original Sin was transmitted to the race and thus [required?] our Redemption by Jesus Christ. Obviously, without the common First Parents, Christianity is meaningless.

But Evolution teaches Polygenism, the multiple origins of the human race. Polygenism is indeed essential to the Evolutionist postulate, for if there be a universal law transforming the animals into higher animals and, finally, the monkeys into men, it is quite inconceivable that the monkey-man transformation should take place at only one spot, with only one pair of monkeys, and stop there. Thus we are faced with an unbridgable chasm between the doctrine of one pair of First Parents and Evolution. What solution do the Theistic Evolutionists offer for this dilemma?

Believe it or not - as the saying goes- Britain's leading Catholic Evolutionist, Fr. Nesbitt, in his recent pamphlet, **Evolution and Original Sin** ["faith pamphlets"] offers the solution that there was an Evolution of "5 or 6 pairs within the same stem or phylum", and, "then it would seem quite probable that if one or two sinned this would affect the rest so that they would sin also."

Note, according to this thesis, God stopped the Evolution of the whole monkey race into man. Then, did He

confine the great transformation to one pair of monkeys ? No, He made the transformation apply to "5 or 6 pairs" (this solution to keep us on the Evolution platform). Then, undaunted by the penalty of death attached to the first Adam and Eve's sin, the other Adams and Eves went and did likewise - or, perhaps, each and every pair fell into the same sin simultaneously !

Quite seriously, this incredible sort of thing is what the Catholic Evolutionist teacher must offer to his pupils, **that is if the doctrines of the First Parents and Original Sin are to be retained.** Is it any wonder, then, that the pupils listen with tongue in cheek, and, as they have been told that Evolution is accepted by all the scientists, they plump for the real Evolution, Evolution without a God, for the idea of a "god" identifiable with the great Evolution process ? And this is what is happening in the Catholic schools today. [And still is, 16 years later - Ed.]

Genesis

According to the Theistic Evolutionists, Genesis is to be regarded as purely symbolic, "a hymn of praise", and so on; and attempts are made to interpret this first chapter of Sacred Scripture in an Evolutionist light. Yet the pupils are bound to observe that there are repeated statements which do not seem at all to be symbolic. Two statements will be examined in this review, that concerning the Six Days of Creation, the other, "each according to its kind".

The Genesis Day

As is well known, the Biblical Commission in 1909 gave permission for the word "day" (the Hebrew word "yom") to be examined as other than our present natural day. But it is incorrect to assume that the Biblical Commission thereby plumped for the Evolutionist "day". The Commission's permission was that the Genesis day could be examined as other than our twenty-four hour day, as some period of time. It could be examined as a twenty-three hour day, as a thirty-six hour day, and in fact, it could be examined as a fraction-of-a-second day, i.e. by those who incline to favour the lightning-flash idea of Creation. **

However, what the Theistic Evolutionists do is to claim that the Genesis account can be interpreted in the Evolutionist context, that the days of Genesis fit in admirably with the Evolutionist aeons of time necessary for the Evolutionist emergence of the kinds, that each Genesis "day" represents a period of many millions of years. But let us look at Genesis again. And here we note that after the work of each day come the statements, "And there was evening and there was morning, one day", "And there was evening and there was morning, a third day", and so on, and this statement is repeated **six times**. Thus, no matter how one might speculate on the periods of time, there is the fact that the same Sacred Writer who wrote the word "day" also wrote down - six times - after the account of each day, that the day was a period of light and darkness, as is our present natural day. Then, could alternative periods of light and darkness ("evening and morning") be applied to the Evolutionist "day" of millions of years? No, for million years periods of alternate light and darkness would have destroyed all plant life upon the earth even before the animals appeared to feed upon it! It is almost as if the Sacred Writer, by insisting upon "evening and morning", were forestalling any "symbolic" or Evolutionist idea of the Genesis day in advance.

"Each according to its kind".

The other statement to be examined is, "each according to its kind" which occurs after the account of the creation of each kind of plant, fish, animal, etc. Please note, this phrase is used in Genesis 1 precisely ten times, as if the Sacred Writer, once again, were determined to give no room for the slightest misunderstanding or ambiguity. One could wax quite eloquent here, but it is only necessary to point out that phrase "each according to its kind" is the direct contrary of any description of evolution of the kinds from one primeval kind.

Here one might also mention that Evolution teaches that its processes began in the seas, and then came the millions of years climb upwards. But Genesis states that plant life was created on the third day, and the marine creatures not until the fifth day. The Evolution account has it that the birds evolved from the reptiles, which in their turn had

evolved from the fishes, but Genesis states that the birds were created together with the fishes. And these are only some of the examples.

Thus, with the Genesis day, with "each according to its kind", with the Genesis chronology of creation and that of Evolution there appears an indubitable contradiction. And thus, it is quite useless for the Evolutionist teacher to say that he is interpreting Genesis, for one cannot honestly say that one is interpreting an account by dismissing its most positive and detailed statements as mis-statements of facts.

And here let it be repeated, this twin business of saying that Evolution is proved by science and that the Bible really agrees with the Evolution account is received with tongue-in-cheek scepticism by the students. They conclude that - Evolution being scientifically proved - Religion must be of the sphere of myth, and they plump for the real atheistic Evolution. It is well known that many, very many, of the pupils emerge from the Catholic schools today rejecting, or at least sceptical of, all supernatural religion.

But there is a way out for the Theistic Evolution teacher. That is to examine, scientifically and philosophically, whether Evolution be true or not. After all, should not one assure oneself of the truth of Evolution before setting out to make the teaching of Religion conform to it ?

oooOooo

* There follows on pp 14-15 a list of such scientists, who have opposed evolution since Darwin's day. It was compiled from various sources, and only represents some of the best-known examples. The case against evolution is, of course, based on reason, evidence and philosophy, not on opinion polls or Ph.D scores. The names listed are evidence that opposition to evolution is not the result of scientific ignorance or incompetence.

** Details of the Pontifical Biblical Commission's rulings are printed on pp 16-18.

Ed.

SCIENTISTS OPPOSED TO EVOLUTION

Louis Pasteur (1822-1895) - "One of the greatest scientists in history." [Asimov].

Gregor Mendel (1822-1884) - discoverer of the principles of genetics.

Professor Claude Bernard (1813-1878) - founder of modern physiology, and member of the French Academy.

Professor Sir Richard Owen (1804-1892) - leading comparative anatomist, and first Director of the British Museum (Natural History); coined the name 'dinosaur'.

Professor J.L.R.Agassiz (1807-1873) - zoologist and geologist - "...laid the foundation of scientific zoology in America." [Williams' Dictionary of Scientists].

Professor Rudolf Virchow (1821-1902) - founder of cellular pathology, President of the German Anthropological Society - "It is quite certain that man has descended neither from an ape nor from any other animal."

Professor James Clerk Maxwell (1831-1879) - electromagnetic theory and equations.

Professor Sir J.Ambrose Fleming F.R.S. (1849-1945) - pioneer in electronics; inventor of the thermionic valve. President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; founder and President of the Evolution Protest Movement. "Evolution is baseless and quite incredible."

Professor Sir Ernst Chain - Nobel Prize in 1945 for work on penicillin.

Professor Louis Vialleton - author of L'Illusion Transformiste.

Dr.Louis Bounoure - Director at the National Centre of Scientific Research in France : "Evolution is a fairy-tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless."

Professor W.R.Thompson, F.R.S., Director of the Commonwealth Institute for Biological Control.

Professor Paul Lemoine, Director of the National Museum of Natural History, Paris, and past President of the Geological Society of France.

Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A., Vice-chairman of the British School of Archaeology in Egypt.

Dr. Heribert Nilsson, Professor of Botany at Lund University, Sweden - "...the idea of evolution...always leads to incredible contradictions and confusing consequences on account of which the evolution theory ought to be entirely abandoned..."

Sir Cecil Wakeley, Bart., KBE, CB, KStJ, MCH, DSc, LL.D., FRCS, etc., Past President of the Royal College of Surgeons, and of EPM. "It seems such a pity in a scientific age where precision and detail are so important that the vast majority of modern scientists believe in evolution, and yet all the basic facts are against such a theory."

Professor Albert Fleischmann - Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at Erlangen University, Germany.

Professor D. Carazzi, Padua University (Zoology).

Dr. Werner von Braun - rocketry and spacecraft.

G. Sermonti - Professor of Genetics, Perugia University.

R. Fondi - Professor of Palaeontology, Siena University.

Dr. T. Barnes - Professor of Physics, University of Texas.

Professor Verna Wright, M.D., F.R.C.P. - Rheumatologist - President of the Creation Science Movement.

Dr. D. Kuznetsov M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc. - founder of the Moscow Creation Science Fellowship, of over 100 scientists.

Professor Young-Gil Kim, Materials Scientist, President of the Korea Association of Creation Research, of over 1000.

Professor Maciej Giertych, of the Polish Institute of Dendrology, geneticist.

Professor Edward Boudreaux, Physical Chemist, New Orleans.

Professor E. Andrews, Materials Science, Queen Mary, London.

Dr. H. Morris, **Dr. D. Gish**, and over 600 members of the Creation Research Society, all with postgraduate science degrees.

from Creation Rediscovered
acknowledgements to Gerard Keane

Pontifical Biblical Commission

In 1909 the Pontifical Biblical Commission declared its ruling on the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis.¹ The actual statements of the Commission are as follows:

1. False Exegesis:

Whether the various exegetical systems, which have been elaborated and defended by the aid of a science falsely so-called, for the purpose of excluding the literal historical sense of the first three chapters of Genesis, are based upon solid arguments.

Answer: In the negative.

2. Historical Character of the First Three Chapters:

Whether we may, in spite of the character and historic form of the book of Genesis, of the close connection of the first three chapters with one another and with those which follow, of the manifold testimony of the Scriptures both of the Old and the New Testament, of the almost unanimous opinion of the Fathers, and of the traditional view which — transmitted also by the Jewish people — have always been held by the Church, teach that the three aforesaid chapters do not contain the narrative of things which actually happened, a narrative which corresponds to objective reality and historic truth; and whether we may teach that these chapters contain fables derived from mythologies and cosmologies belonging to older nations, but purified of all polytheistic error and accommodated to monotheistic teaching by the sacred author or that they contain allegories and symbols destitute of any foundation in objective reality but

¹Biblical Commission on Genesis 1-3, (June 30, 1909) Denzinger 3512-9

presented under the garb of history for the purpose of inculcating religious and philosophical truth; or, finally that they contain legends partly historical and partly fictitious, freely handled for the instruction and edification of souls.

Answer: In the negative to each part.

3. Historical Character of Certain Parts:

Whether, in particular, we may call in question the literal and historical meaning where there is question of facts narrated in these chapters which touch the fundamental teachings of the Christian religion, as for example, the creation of all things by God in the beginning of time, the special creation of man, the formation of the first woman from man, the unity of the human race, the original happiness of our first parents in a state of justice, integrity, and immortality, the divine command laid upon man to prove his obedience, the transgression of that divine command at the instigation of the devil under the form of a serpent, the fall of our first parents from their primitive state of innocence, and the promise of a future Redeemer.

Answer: In the negative.

4. Interpretation:

Whether, in interpreting those passages of these chapters which the Fathers and Doctors have interpreted in diverse ways without leaving us anything definite or certain, anyone may, subject to the decision of the Church and following the analogy of faith, follow and defend that opinion at which he has prudently arrived.

Answer: In the affirmative.

5. Literal Sense:

Whether all and each of the parts, namely, the single words and phrases, in these chapters must always and of necessity be interpreted in a literal sense, so that it is never lawful to deviate from it, even when expressions are manifestly used figuratively, that is, metamorphically or anthropomorphically, and when reason forbids us to hold, or necessity impels us to depart from the literal sense.

Answer: In the negative.

6. Allegory and Prophecy:

Whether, granting always the literal and historical sense, the allegorical and prophetic interpretation of certain passages of these chapters — an interpretation justified by the example of the Fathers and the Church — may be prudently and usefully applied.

Answer: In the affirmative.

7. Scientific Expression:

Whether, since it was not the intention of the sacred author, when writing the first chapters of Genesis, to teach us in a scientific manner the innermost nature of visible things, and to present the complete order of creation but rather to furnish his people with a popular account, such as the common parlance of that age allowed, one, namely, adapted to the senses and to man's intelligence, we are strictly and always bound, when interpreting these chapters to seek for scientific exactitude of expression.

Answer: In the negative.

8. Whether the word *yom* (day) which is used in the first chapters of Genesis to describe and distinguish the six days, may be taken either in its strict sense as the natural day, or in a less strict sense as signifying a certain space of time; and whether free discussion of this question is permitted to interpreters.

Answer: In the affirmative.

THE ORIGINS DEBATE

The Need For The Catholic Origins Society

The formation of the **Catholic Origins Society** is an attempt being made by Catholics in various countries to draw together the riches of modern science with the riches of Catholic Tradition. Fair praise is surely due to the highly credentialled scientists/scholars (mainly Protestants but not exclusively so) who have been involved in creationist research for many years and have shown that the discoveries of modern science do not support the idea of evolution. However, given the present state of crisis within the Catholic Church in Western countries, there is a pressing need also to show convincingly that such discoveries in fact harmonize very well with the truths of faith handed down within the Catholic Church since the time of Christ and the Church Fathers.

The return of Creation to centre stage within Catholicism is overdue. Cardinal Ratzinger, speaking in Austria (May 1989) recognized the almost complete disappearance of the doctrine of creation and called for its redevelopment as a matter of high priority ... "such an undertaking ought to be regarded as one of the most pressing tasks of theology today".

The details of the true story of Creation are not yet fully known (and may never be fully known this side of eternity) but the overall picture can now be understood in greater focus than ever before in the history of mankind. Enough of the details are known with great clarity. This can only aid in the recovery of nerve against the dissenters and assist in the restoration of the Catholic Church, if enough interest is taken to spread the story. The Bishops in Western countries may respond if enough of the laity see the true story of Creation as being of crucial importance to the vitality of Christian faith.

The following points provide an appreciation of the Origins debate, from a Catholic perspective. All can be substantiated with sound reasoning and ample reference material.

**G J Keane
Melbourne
October 1994**

- The creation/evolution debate is only part of a greater contest which is best described as the **Origins Debate**. Scientific aspects are very important but so also are philosophical and theological arguments. The real debate is all about beliefs and not just science.
- **Truth** is one. Human beings can err and arrive at incorrect conclusions but science and theology *per se* can never be in contradiction because God is the author of both. Theology, once described as the queen of sciences, is the most profound and trustworthy source of learning.
- Evidence for an unseen Designer is overwhelming, and the new **Catechism Of The Catholic Church** declares that the existence of God can be known with certainty from the created world by the natural light of human reason [36].
- It is important to seek an understanding of what God **chose** to do when creating space, matter and time, and life on Earth. What He **could** have done is another matter, and very likely mostly beyond our limited human intelligence. If we try to focus on what He chose to do, at least this may help to avoid branching off into confusion.
- Scientific advances made over the last several decades, especially in the disciplines of genetics and molecular biology, have shed profound new light on the reality of DNA and thus made possible for the first time in human history a much greater technical understanding of the living forms created by God.
- What is “**evolution**”? It is commonly understood as “the more complex coming from the simple”, and must involve the gaining of new, higher genetic information not previously possessed within each kind of creature or plant. The normal growth to maturity within life forms (such as an acorn growing into an oak tree) is not a valid definition of evolution. After thousands of years, oak trees are still oak trees; they cannot turn into, say, lemon trees.
- Is “**evolution**” a fact to be accounted for, or hypotheses to be tested? If the former view is held (and it is by many zealots) then we are dealing with beliefs and not science *per se*. No amount of facts showing the falsehood of macroevolution will dent the **faith** of the zealot, but most open-minded individuals are willing to look at the strengths and weaknesses of evolution theory.
- The unique events of the Universe coming into existence cannot be repeated and no version of “**evolution**” can explain how matter came about from nothing. But specific **mechanisms** of evolution theory (after matter has come into existence) can be subjected to test and comparison. All the various mechanisms proposed to explain how macroevolution could work have been found wanting when analysed.

- It is incorrect to assert that evolution has not been proven, as if to imply that the elusive mechanism for macroevolution may yet be found. By all reasonable standards of criteria, biological macroevolution cannot possibly have occurred. We really are dealing with the **myth** of evolution!
- Darwin reckoned that the numbers of **transitional forms** waiting to be found in the fossil record must be “inconceivably great”. On the contrary, not one has been found and substantiated beyond doubt! It is now known that the “missing links” are uniformly missing across the spectrum, and not just between humans and apelike creatures. Dr Marvin Lubenow argues powerfully in **Bones Of Contention** that Homo Sapiens and Homo Erectus actually date back contemporaneously. Homo Sapiens specimens, even according to the evolution/old ages timetable, date back earlier than Homo Erectus!
- The theory of biological evolution has been effectively destroyed in the science of **genetics**, which was unknown in Darwin’s time. Thus it is valid now to declare, with virtual certainty, that DNA must have been designed by God so that only microevolution (i.e., genetic variation) can take place. Cats and dogs come in all shapes and sizes but they can never be anything other than cats or dogs. We now can understand, much better than ever before, that the missing links could never have existed because God directly created (via rapid Special Creation) every life form in their own “kind” (with specific genetic information) and set in train the marvellous interdependence in nature.
- Specialists in genetics have tabled compelling arguments, which show that the idea of intermediate stages (i.e., transitional forms) is conceptually untenable and that the design of DNA cannot allow **macroevolution**. Reptiles cannot evolve by random chance processes into birds - the lungs of birds are radically dissimilar from other forms of life. No mechanism will naturally allow new “higher” genetic information to be gained by each “kind” and the Law of Causality states that nothing can give what it does not already possess. Even billions of years of time cannot alter this reality concerning macroevolution. Thus one can safely conclude that transitional forms are impossible within the type of creation chosen to be implemented by God.
- To assert all this is not conveniently to use selective quotations favouring one’s personal subjective bias regarding creation/evolution. Rather, it is to recognize objective truth. These are concrete findings now shared by growing numbers of highly credentialled scientists (not all of whom describe themselves as creationists). Many evolutionary scientists assert otherwise of course but in their argumentation they very often beg the question and resort to little more than **semantics**, scientism and ridicule.

- Evolution theory is still in essence all about random chance processes and a profound act of faith is required from the adherent. But it is highly inconsistent to appeal to much greater odds than those rejected by everyone as impossibly high in the science of **fingerprints**. There exists an effective precedent locked into place in law, inextricably bound up with the science of fingerprints, which ought to be deferred to whenever the idea of immense odds is under discussion. This dependence upon immense odds poses a serious dilemma for those who hold that macroevolution really is credible theory.
- Evidence for the **Flood** of Noah is truly overwhelming. Voluminous information can readily be tabled to show that the global Flood is true history.
- **Evolutionism** has had a terrible impact upon mankind. Quite apart from the terrible impact upon Nazi and Communist mentality, unborn human beings are clearly seen by multitudes as expendable to the convenience of the mother. Belief in objective truth and moral absolutes has diminished, due to belief in evolution and acceptance of secular humanism. (We're only evolving animals, aren't we? The foetus is not really human, and I don't care anyway - I will do whatever I please. And don't annoy me with the idea of a Creator to whom I am accountable!)
- Belief in evolution is of great importance to the psyche of radical **feminism**. The very idea of inclusive language shows that the reality of the complementarity of the sexes has become obscured. Those who hold that Genesis contains unbelievable fables are unlikely to grasp fully the truth that God has designed different but complementary roles for males and females.
- How can **pro-life** forces succeed in overturning the holocaust in liberal democratic societies when the kingship of God has virtually been banished and the wishes of the people set the standards for behaviour? In such a sinful generation as will allow 4,000 abortions each day in the USA, it's literally a battle with Satanic forces. The great need is somehow to bring mankind back to a sense of awe and respect for God. Prolife activists thus may welcome the work being done by creationists in trying to bring mankind back to God and thus bringing back more respect for the sanctity of life.
- No longer are Christian values sensed as worthy of deference out there in secular society; the **humanist culture** has radically transformed what is held to be normal moral behaviour. And it is an open secret that multitudes of Catholics now practice contraception and the link between contraception and abortion mentality is well known. But not only do the laity have to be reached with a message that transcends shallow theology; the clergy also have to be convinced of the soundness of Creation theology.

- With the demise in understanding of the doctrine of **Original Sin**, the sense of the sacred has been lost to sight by multitudes of Christians, and with it also the loss of dread of Hell. In place of respect for **objective truth**, many Catholics are interested only in subjective ideas and seem to assume that they are saved anyway. Homilies on Original Sin are now very rare, and many priests perhaps fear being confronted with questions such as, "If Adam and Eve were the first two human beings, who did their children marry?" Great emphasis is given to preaching on love, but little emphasis on Christ's sober warnings about losing one's soul.
- Even **liturgy** has been affected. With Genesis held by many priests to contain only religious "stories" which one doesn't take as literally true (e.g., Adam and Eve never existed as a pair of real human beings), it is little wonder that the idea of the Mass being the sacrifice of Jesus Christ has been greatly diminished in favour of being little more than a community meal. This would explain why "the cult of the personality" often comes to the fore in the celebration of the *Novus Ordo*.
- Western societies are becoming increasingly like **the ancient Greeks** who did not have the idea of a Creator as did the Jews. In reaching them we need, like St Paul, to inform them about creation. Without an informed sense of God the Creator, how can the idea of the Redeemer be truly understood? The idea of "Christ crucified" does not fully make sense without knowing the story of what brought on the need for Christ to pay the ransom for mankind.
- The growth of New Age **pantheism** is greatly enhanced because the true story of creation has effectively been lost (largely by default). Individuals will always desire some meaning in their lives but scores of weird movements now offer conflicting explanations of reality which reject true Christian doctrine. The idea of the "immanent God within" must be countered with the true story of the omnipotent Creator God.
- Church scholars in the latter part of the **19th century** made a grave mistake in trying to harmonize belief in evolution with Christian doctrine. They unwittingly accepted a view of science which is now known to be mistaken, and the resulting synthesis helped facilitate all sorts of erroneous theological beliefs (Higher Criticism etc) to become widely accepted within the Church and to erode the doctrinal basis of belief.
- Unfortunately, while many scientists now have little time for evolution theory, it seems that the majority of Church scholars (both liberal and conservative) still give credence to evolution or are hampered by certain evolutionist presuppositions accepted uncritically. Belief in evolution theory led many scholars to accept the idea that even doctrine itself is ever shifting and subject to **change**. Hardly consistent with the idea of objective truth and moral absolutes.

- It's time to reconsider the whole notion of the **trustworthiness** of God and look once again at the foundational importance of Genesis to Christianity. We have revelation given to us by the only eye-witness who was there during the creation events, and that eyewitness (God) is totally trustworthy. Just as we can only be informed about the Trinity and cannot deduce it, so also we can only be informed about the events of creation. How else could we know about the creation?
- The idea of **complete inerrancy** of Scripture must be defended absolutely, and partial inerrancy rejected as heretical. As the new Catechism notes, God can neither deceive nor be deceived. Since God is the principal author of all Scripture, it is erroneous to hold that it is only free from error in a "religious" sense.
- If even one aspect of liberal theology is accepted, then the holder is compromised. On what authority do we **take seriously** anything in Scripture? Why hold some things dear in the Bible and others not?
- The revelation given in **Romans 5:12** is of vital importance. The new Catechism reaffirms that sin came into the world by one man (Adam) and with sin came death. Tranquillity of order was lost. We would not have known suffering or death if Adam had chosen obedience to God. This teaching on death, held authoritatively since antiquity, will always be a great stumbling block for any version of evolution theory.
- Similarly, **polygenism** was declared by Pius XII as being essentially irreconcilable with the doctrine of Original Sin. (That the Pope regarded it as irreconcilable was openly admitted by Fr Franklin Ewing SJ, an American Professor of Anthropology and theistic evolutionist, writing in 1956.) If Adam came about by any form of evolution from animal parents, then ultimately our great Redeemer's own body can in a sense be said to trace from animal ancestry - but theistic evolutionists never think hard enough to even be aware of such difficulties. It's ironic, considering that the new Catechism says the second Adam created the first Adam, body and soul.
- Without polygenism, there is no possibility for biological evolution to give rise to human beings. Evolution theory requires that there be death of Adam's "ancestors", so whoever says the Catholic Church has not declared against evolution is missing the point: Catholic doctrine and biological evolution cannot be harmonized. There can be no such thing as a human being without a **rational soul**, as the Catechism declares, so we can conclude with certainty from Tradition that Adam could not have had ancestors who were not fully human beings. And we know for sure he had no human ancestors!

- Pius XII never allowed evolution as an **open question** anyway, but only granted permission for speculation about it (remember that *Humani Generis* was issued in 1950, three years before the model of DNA was fashioned by Crick and Watson). He emphasized that arguments both for and against evolution must be given due consideration, and evolution must not be taught as though proven. In doing so he indicated that he was aware there were very strong arguments against evolution. The permission should now be closed anyway because the true answer is known.
- With no alternative but to avoid the problem of death, theistic evolutionists are forced to abandon the original quest to synthesize biological evolution with Catholic doctrine and to resort to **divine intervention**. Thus, what they loosely call “evolution” is not evolution at all but rather is little more than **anthropomorphism**. In reality, theistic evolution has nothing whatsoever to do with evolution as commonly understood (the more complex slowly coming from the simple) and is plagued with certain conceptual problems anyway. No version of “evolution” can account for the origin of **Eve’s body**.
- Divine intervention is necessary in order to rescue “evolution” and override secondary causes, for theistic evolution requires that God tinkered with DNA (chromosomes etc) so that apelike parents gave rise to another “kind”, namely human beings. Unfortunately, however, this means that Adam must have arrived as a **baby boy** with no-one to nurture him or convey abstract ideas. Such a scenario is untenable.
- Thus, the very idea of **secondary causes** (in this case, the natural properties of life forms programmed into them by the Creator) is abandoned when it suits theistic evolution theory. The idea of secondary causes, long claimed so eagerly by theistic evolutionists and long-agers as **central** to their beliefs, can on the contrary be shown to be a strong argument for direct creation and a young Universe. It is abandoned time and again in order to justify “evolution” and such things as the existence of comets, which have an upper limit of 10,000 years and no known source of replenishment.
- The idea of the Genesis account being purified from pagan mythologies of neighboring countries is mistaken. Rather it is a **partial account** of the true revelation given on creation, and which was perverted by later generations. Genesis is not a scientific textbook but real history nevertheless, and confirmed as such by Pius XII. The historicity of Genesis is really obligatory belief for all Catholics because it is locked into place in Catholic Tradition.
- If Genesis is written off as mythical, it’s not a big step to accept the Fall as only a moral “story”. But if the Fall is not true history, there is no need for a Redeemer and obviously no need for the Mother of God. Evolution theory has clearly been **spiritually devastating** to many individuals. How many scholars have “read themselves out of the Church” after imbibing such things as Higher Criticism?

- **The Fall** did not just affect human beings; all of the Universe was adversely affected. Again, this is reaffirmed in the new Catechism.
- Arguments for a young Universe are very substantial and outweigh those for an old Universe. **Is it valid to draw a connection between vast distances and vast ages of time?** Does the **appearance of age** in the Universe indicate deceit by God, or is it an incorrect conclusion deduced by mistaken human beings?
- **Uniformitarianism** is clearly invalid on Earth, and even Fr Stanley Jaki, a passionate theistic evolutionist and old-ager, said of astronomers and the Solar System that "they have no idea of planetary formation"*. So how can one be sure that uniformitarianism holds true way out there in the Universe? It ignores the possibility that God literally "stretched out the Universe" in the mysterious days of creation, giving the appearance of age. Who can say with certainty that He did not do so? (* Melbourne speech 1992.)
- Many arguments can be cited from an array of scientific, philosophical and theological aspects in favour of a young Universe but there is no need for the Catholic Church to declare specifically one way or the other. What is clear however is that **the onus of proof** is upon the long-ager to prove his /her case. The onus does not lie with the young-ager. As Pope Leo XIII taught in *Providentissimus Deus*, the literal view of Scripture holds the ground until disproven - this is locked into place in Catholic Tradition.
- We know that not all of Genesis is given in the literal-as-given sense. The big question is, which passages are not? Pius XII declared in *Humani Generis* that Genesis does contain "**history in the true sense**", though not conveyed in the way of a modern historian. The problem right now is that most scholars are loath to give any credence to anything being literally true in Genesis. This is like cancer eating away at the vitality of doctrine because Genesis is so foundational to Christianity.
- By all means, let the old-agers proceed to prove their case. Let them, for example, prove that all the Rabbis before the time of Christ and all the Fathers after him were all wrong in holding to the idea that Genesis was intended by the sacred writer(s) to be understood as an **historical document**. Let them prove that uniformitarianism holds true out there in the Universe when it has been shown to be untenable here on Earth. Let them also prove that *yom* in the context does not mean literal days of 24 hours. And there's a great deal more awaiting them, to prove that the senses of Genesis 1-11 cannot be taken in any way literally.
- Belief in the long ages should not be **imposed upon Scripture**, and then used as a starting presupposition in determining the senses applicable in Genesis. Nor should belief in the myth of evolution be similarly imposed upon Scripture studies.

- Pope John Paul II has made comments which suggest that he believes that biological evolution is a fact of history, but he does not make clear the distinction between macro and microevolution. He also seems to give credence to the Documentary Theory of the Pentateuch. Fortunately, all of this is in a **non-Magisterial** medium. Would he do so in an encyclical, when he would be protected by the Holy Spirit from teaching error?
- What chance does the present Pope have of being fully informed about the Origins debate? How does he obtain the full truth of the findings of modern science? The **Pontifical Academy of Sciences** is heavily pro-evolution and pro-long ages and thus hardly likely to pass on creationist arguments, and they obviously constantly have his ear (the apology to Galileo was really unwarranted). It is known also that Teilhard de Chardin's influence still lingers very strongly today in Poland - has it even affected in some way the present Pope's views on Origins? And what impact does the Pope's philosophical leanings on Phenomenology have on the way he perceives the Universe as being open to change?
- The new **Catechism** contains ample material, signed by the Pope in a clearly **Magisterial medium**, which overall supports a creationist position and gives little comfort to theistic evolutionists. Evolutionists will have to resort to mental gymnastics to read support for evolution into the Catechism, but any such claims [e.g. 283] can readily be countered with creationist arguments.
- As for the document issued by the **Pontifical Biblical Commission** (in early 1994) on the interpretation of Scripture, what can one say other than it is appalling? So how does the Pope find out the whole truth, especially when so many of the conservatives/ orthodox activists keep a safe distance from the Origins debate, perhaps for fear of being tagged fundamentalist or "more Catholic than the Pope" ?
- Cardinal Ratzinger's book **In The Beginning** on Origins (homilies given in the early 80s and published by others in the mid 80s) is also disturbing but, given the tone of his 1989 speech in Austria, he may have moved on since then. In one of the homilies he said there is no such thing as creation or evolution but rather creation and evolution, and no distinction drawn between macro or microevolution.
- There is no such thing as a Catholic "fundamentalist" and it is blatantly unfair to raise this fantasy as though real. Nevertheless there it is in the latest document released by the PBC. Clearly, Catholics can point to **Tradition, the Magisterium, the Papacy** - by definition therefore a Catholic cannot be a fundamentalist. Contrary to popular mythology, the term is not synonymous with a literal-as-given acceptance of Scripture. The "fundamentals" defined by certain Protestants last century were an attempt to find a source of authority better than majority vote. But without the Pope as the final decision-maker there is no authority authorised by Christ. *Sola scriptura* will not suffice.

- Do we really want genuine restoration in the Catholic Church? Scores of distressing books have been written about the lamentable state of affairs within Catholicism in Western countries, but there is also a need to define what can be done to redress the situation. Why is creationism so unpopular among the large Catholic organizations who deplore Modernism, when the Origins debate touches upon vital aspects of the struggle? Perhaps an underlying reason is the existence of a most unhealthy dose of Ultramontanism, out of touch with an informed understanding of Catholic beliefs.
- We must draw a distinction between the person of Jesus Christ and the office of the Papacy. Christ is divine but each Pope is a human being. Popes can and do make mistakes, especially in matters of prudential judgement. (The long delay by Paul VI before releasing *Humanae Vitae* helped erode its strength; by 1968 many Catholics were already won over by the dissenting theologians and the secular culture into support for contraception. And the permission to allow altar girls is debilitating for the conservatives, no matter who actually brought on the change.*) Every informed Catholic knows all about the corrupt Popes of previous centuries. So the fear of being "more Catholic than the Pope" is misplaced - better to concentrate on truth.
- * Despite all the controversy about who approved the use of altar girls, all that was needed was the release of a short Papal statement rejecting them, just as John Paul II wrote in rejection of female priests. The more time that passes, the less credible will be such a statement. Once admitted, on what grounds will they be refused in the future?
- The central doctrines of the Catholic Church have not changed in 2,000 years; the promise of Christ that each Pope would have protection from teaching doctrinal error has proven true. Is this not further adequate reason for complete trust in the historical nature of the revelation given us in Genesis by God and referred to by Christ himself?
- The Catholic Church is under siege from within and without, and the dissenters rely absolutely on both belief in evolution and belief in the long ages of the Universe for so-called justification of their Modernist views. Meanwhile many of the conservative/ orthodox Orders and lay movements are largely impotent because of a poor grasp of Origins. They are handicapped with an incomplete diagnosis of what is wrong in the modern day troubled Church.
- The dissent within shows little signs of abating, and the Modernists are getting away with murder of the faith of others. The vulnerable young victims are being denied their right to knowledge of truth and an informed understanding of Catholic beliefs, and it is outrageous that this should take place in Catholic centres of learning. (The revolution within the Church has also led to greatly reduced

numbers of peers among the young who share similar beliefs.) The question must be tabled, "What if the conservative Catholics are wrong in their dismissal of creationism - are they not unwittingly helping the dissenters to go on robbing the faith of the young?"

- The Origins debate really is important in the struggle with Modernism. For example, acceptance of the idea of limited inerrancy places that person, unwittingly, in a compromised doctrinal position, and this ironically plays right into the hands of the dissenters who proceed onwards with their **revisionist theology**.
- Whether consciously or otherwise, the prevailing attitude seems to be this: Better to consign Genesis to fantasy-land than to address the fact known from Catholic Tradition that Genesis was intended by the sacred writer(s) to be understood as an historical document! (No-one claims it is a scientific textbook, except those who misrepresent creationists for doing so.) Better to let evolution be portrayed as factual in Catholic centres of learning rather than insist that the effective **censorship** be ended and the pros and cons taught as demanded by Pius XII.
- An unfortunate factor is the **perceived split between science and theology**, lingering from the Galileo Case. (The issue of heliocentrism or geocentrism is still hotly debated among Christians.) Some conservatives take the attitude that theology must never again enter into matters of science, but the Church has every right to when science impacts upon matters of theology and exegesis. The Catholic Church did in fact enter into science in the matters of contraception and natural family planning.
- We live in an age of great collapse of Christian faith. Seen in the context of history, this present collapse is another cyclical phase but one can't help thinking that it was entirely avoidable. However we don't know what is in the divine plan of **Providence** and perhaps the Catholic Church is doomed to reduce down to a tiny remnant before the second coming of Christ. Nevertheless the salvation of souls is at stake and so there is an obligation to try to stem the tide by prayer and the Sacraments, and positive actions that are within one's ability. The **Catholic Origins Society** is worthy of support.

G J Keane
Melbourne
October 1994

CREATION, LAWLESSNESS, AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

Ellen Myers

A missionary friend writes us from Brazil: "In a 1988 international study, Sao Paulo was cited as having the most violent traffic in the world. Crime (especially armed robbery) is almost anarchical--as most of our friends have experienced at least once. In the midst of all this, evangelicalism, spiritism and materialism continue to grow in the vacuum formed by a dying Catholicism. On a far deeper level--one touching honesty, discipline, family and chastity--the difference between North America's heritage from the pilgrims, and South America's heritage from the conquistadores is evident on every side." At the same time a Swiss friend grieves because Switzerland now has the highest AIDS rate and the highest suicide rate in Europe, divorce and crime abound, the law is not enforced, and the Swiss State and evangelical church remain silent. Meanwhile in the United States yet another shocking expose about widespread corruption among New York policemen becomes a best seller.¹ An increasing number of bizarre murders and mutilation of animals witnesses to the new wave of traditional and especially "non-traditional" satanism which contributes to the lawless terror in the United States and around the world today.²

The well-informed *Christian Anti-Communism Crusade Newsletter* reports on the growing anarchy in Peru, hit by a 2500 to 3000 percent annual inflation rate and the terrorism of a communist guerrilla group calling itself the "Shining Path" (Sendero Luminoso). Ill-paid soldiers of the regular army pretend to lose their weapons while really selling them to the rebels. International terrorism is an ever-present threat, as is the international drug traffic. In the United States no one is safe in the public schools in the inner cities where discipline has often totally broken down.

Worst, this shattering social disintegration everywhere and in all areas of life has existed and escalated for many years. We are living in an age of unprecedented world-wide lawlessness where the "silent majority" of reasonably law-abiding people is crying out for "peace and safety" (I Thessalonians 5:3).

As always, man looking to himself as his own helper, provider, lord and master appeals to his own reason, ingenuity and power for a way out. He calls upon human government to suppress anarchy by stricter laws and law enforcement. Now in a way this reliance upon government is in conformity with the biblical Christian view. God appointed government authorities for the purpose of punishing evildoers, even to the extent of taking their lives, for the ruler "does not bear the sword in vain" (Romans 13:1-8). God's people are to pray for all who are in authority so that they "may lead a quiet and peaceable

Acknowledgements to Ellen Myers and CSSH -CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XII, No. 3 (Spring 1990)

life in all godliness and reverence" (1 Timothy 2:1-2). Most unbelievers would agree that government exists to keep citizens safe from perpetrators of crimes against the person. Hence Bible-believing Christians need not altogether condemn unbelievers demanding more government action in the present crisis of lawlessness, nor can Christians advocate anarchism (abolition of all government). God ordained government precisely to put down and restrain anarchy; the very term "anarchy" is a synonym for "lawlessness."

On the other hand, Christians must oppose to the death any and all attempts of government to exercise authority contrary to God's law. For example, Christians cannot permit government/state to hinder or forbid them to bring up their children in the Christian faith ("in the nurture and admonition of the Lord", Ephesians 6:4). Christians must be alert to and protest efforts by government/state agencies, legislatures, public school administrators, etc. to discriminate against the free exercise of their faith. An example of such lawless action by the government itself is the state's demands that anti-Christian books be part of the library of a Christian school. Another example is the state's demand that Christian schools and their teachers be licensed by the government/state in a way involving mandatory implicit or explicit acceptance of its "pluralistic," that is, anti-biblical world view. Yet another example is the state or government's decree that creation cannot be taught in natural science courses in a private Christian school or college (at this writing, Christian Heritage College in California is under such illicit pressure), or that public school-type "sex education" or "values clarification" must be taught in Christian schools. Christian individuals and churches must be free to engage in relief and charity work combined with biblical discipling. They must be free to spread the Gospel, for relief of the poor and evangelizing the lost are the Church's biblical duties under God.

"Lawlessness" hence biblically means disobedience to God's law by government/state as well as by the people, and includes acts legally sanctioned by government and state though forbidden in Scripture. Examples are divorce for any cause "by mutual consent," now "legal" everywhere though divorce is biblically permissible only for adultery (Matthew 5:31-32), and though God hates it (Malachi 2:16). Abortion, also "legal" around the world although proscribed by Scripture, has become a new holocaust which now "legally" kills 55 million pre-born, God-created children every year. The murder of handicapped newborn babies and other helpless aged and infirm victims by forced dehydration and starvation (often a prolonged agony) is now semi-"legal" and approved by some courts (at least in the United States and Holland), though Jesus Christ tells us to love our neighbors as ourselves, and though we are commanded not to do murder (Exodus 20:13). The continuing imprisonment, exile, and confinement in psychiatric hospitals of dissidents, especially Christian believers, is fully sanctioned by Communist governments though altogether lawless in God's sight. Persecution and even murder of Christians in Muslim countries is done today with the Muslim governments' full approval or at least connivance. Other examples of government/state

perpetrated lawlessness are legion. In short, the laws of human governments are often "lawless" when measured by the biblical standard of what is just and right. The Christian, therefore, must often, especially in our generation, "obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29), either by not doing what he "legally" might, or by refusing to obey biblically lawless human government/state rather than God. A beautiful example of such godly refusal is Corrie Ten Boom and her family's sheltering of Jews in Holland under the Nazis in World War II. Scriptural examples are the God-fearing midwives who refused to have any part in the murder of Jewish baby boys under Pharaoh (Exodus 1), and Rahab who hid the Jewish spies because they were the people of the God of Israel (Joshua 2; Hebrews 11:31).

Human government/the state is not absolute master but rather God's and His people's servant. Governments/states attempting to rule as absolute and unchallenged, disregarding or rejecting God, cannot remedy lawlessness in society but rather only aggravate it. Because men around the world today have rejected God and His law, their demand for more, stronger, and eventually unified world government to stem the present tide of lawlessness can only result in *institutionalized* lawlessness all over the world. Even emigrating or escaping abroad, still a way to freedom for some fortunate few in Nazi Germany or in communist countries today, would no longer be possible.

Today's proponents of one-world government are under the illusion that "peace and safety" can be attained without the God the Bible, the Creator and His law for all that is. They assert that the world has always existed by itself, and has progressed by evolution either randomly or by purposive cosmic forces. They claim that man, the end product of this chaotic cosmic evolution, can determine his own conduct moment by moment as he sees fit. Thus the very mode of existence of the world and of man is seen as lawless in principle. At most modern "scientific" man concedes that there are "observed regularities" (formerly called laws of nature), which man may interpret and utilize as best he can. As with evolution itself, so with man and his "self-rule" catastrophic disasters must of necessity occur from time to time. Thus the "great social experiment" of Communism in Russia cost many millions of lives, untold misery, pain and despair, and proved a complete economic failure. The first modern "experiment" in building a new society without God was the French Revolution of 1789. It too destroyed countless innocent lives by deliberate brutal terror, all in the name of utopian "liberty, equality and fraternity." Yet the evolutionist godless utopians are neither repentant over the blood they have shed, nor deterred from trying again and again to organize the world according to their own doctrinaire wishful thinking, lust for power, and hatred of all restraints. The present drive for a one-world state and a one-world religion including all faiths (except biblical Christianity) like its utopian predecessors speaks of the future in high-sounding utopian terms without concrete details and, of course, in complete disregard of the God of the Bible Who commanded all men, and His people in particular, not to have other gods besides Him (Exodus 20:3; James

4:4). The real meat of their program is their fanatical, deluded refusal to submit to the fixed fundamental reality which actually exists due to God's sovereign creative decree "in the beginning." They want to be as gods themselves by creating their own "reality," no matter what the cost to mankind. In promising a man-made paradise they are ushering in a society as near to hell as possible to man, impelled by Satan, who hates God and man created in God's image and likeness, and who is a murderer from the beginning and the father of lies as Jesus Christ says (John 8:44). They might all join together in the song of the Nazis: "We shall march on,/When everything breaks into shards,/For today we own Germany,/Tomorrow the whole world." As George Orwell put it so prophetically in 1984, the true picture of mankind's future under a God-less, lawless one-world government/state is "a boot stomping on a human face--forever."

The God-less utopians are on a collision course with reality. The world, which is the creation of God, can properly function only in accordance with the Creator's "operating manual," His law. If you would reap wheat, you do not sow tares; if you would reap figs, you do not plant thistles. If you would build a house, you must construct it upon a solid foundation. If you would live, you must have air to breathe and food to eat. With regard to government, economics, politics, ethics and morals it is just as true that, as Jesus Christ told the Tempter, "man does not live by bread alone but by every word of God" (Matthew 4:4). The merely utilitarian morality without reference to God by which man thinks he can build a great society has broken down precisely because it was built upon the sand of mere utility. The "useful" is not necessarily the good, and that which men desire is not necessarily desirable. The world is perishing today because most people, deceived by their deceiving leaders, refuse to seek the truly good and the really desirable, God Himself alone (Luke 18:19).

A unified world government/state, born of the ambition of power-seeking elitist leaders (some with great charismatic appeal) and the clamor for "peace and safety" of the common people terrified by today's rampant lawlessness, is now in the making. It is man's most ambitious attempt in world history to be as God and master in a utopian "new age" or "new reality" of his own making. However, because there is only one reality, unalterably established by God's creation in the beginning, the leaders and the people will reap only their own misery and destruction. As Samuel the prophet told the faithless Israelites seeking a king instead of God: *"Only fear the LORD, and serve Him in truth with all your heart; for consider what great things He has done for you. But if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king"* (1 Samuel 12:24-25).

References

1. Mike McAlary, *Buddy Boys*, Charter Book Edition, February 1989.
2. Thomas W. Wedge with Robert L. Powers, *The Satan Hunter*, Daring Books, P.O. [redacted] 1). This is a thoroughly researched book intended for use by law enforcement agencies.

"TELEGRAPHOLOGY"

News from a popular British paper.

ALIEN LIFE ? NOT LIKELY !

"Habitable, Earth-sized planets may be much rarer in the galaxy than is generally believed...

A study of 20 young stars close to the Sun had failed to find evidence for any Jupiter-sized planets in orbit around them..."

Prof. Wetherill thinks such planets are needed to capture asteroids that could cause catastrophic collisions as often as once every 100,000 years.

"This would make it extremely difficult for a civilisation to evolve, and the simple answer is that there might not be one."

"Nonetheless, the existence of both large and small planets in our own solar system showed that habitable worlds must exist.

"Probably about one per cent of the Sun-like stars in our galaxy of 100 billion Sun-like stars have genuinely habitable worlds. This gives us a billion such planets to look for."

9 Feb.'95.

COMMENT: "But we look for new heavens and a new earth according to his promises, in which justice dwelleth."

2 Peter 3:13.

"MANKIND 'SPEEDING UP PACE OF EXTINCTION' "

"As humanity struggles to accommodate the eight billion people due to populate Earth within 50 years, the natural world and the rest of life is being eroded away," said Prof.E.Wilson [of Harvard]". Some 27,000 species each year are reckoned doomed, owing particularly to the destruction of rain forests and coral reefs.

"Each species is a masterpiece of evolution and irreplaceable." 18 Feb.'95

COMMENT: Extinction is an inevitable consequence of evolution, as Darwin wrote:

"...we may predict that, owing to the continued and steady increase of the larger groups, a multitude of smaller groups will become utterly extinct, and leave no modified descendants; and consequently that, of the species living at any one period, extremely few will transmit descendants to a remote futurity." [Origin of Species, chap.4].

Our responsibility is to be good stewards of God's creation, not bow to the myth of 'Evolution'.

LOSING LANGUAGES

"Between five and 10 per cent of the world's 6,000 languages will become extinct within the next century..."

"There is a strong tendency for the world to move towards a universal language and that language is English" said Dr. Oller of Miami." 20 Feb. '95

COMMENT: "Now the whole earth had one language and few words." Gen. 11:1, prior to the building of Babel. But according to Zephaniah 3:9 "Because then I will restore to the people a chosen lip, that all may call upon the name of the Lord..." Should this trend be seen as divinely inspired, or as a preparation for a One-World Government?

OAKS LIKE GREENHOUSE GAS.

"English oaks reach up to three times their normal height when grown in double the concentration of atmospheric carbon dioxide." Such enhanced growth could help reduce the effect of fossil fuel burning, but enlarged trees would demand more water and be more vulnerable to drought.

27 April '95.

COMMENT: This discovery supports the idea that pre-Flood vegetation grew faster and bigger thanks to higher CO₂ and humidity.

HAWKING PAPERBACKS

Now available in paperback, A Brief History of Time has sold more than 8 million copies. 'Superstar' writer Stephen Hawking 'has become the most famous cosmologist in the world.'

M. Barty-King, managing director of the publishing firm, admits: "I didn't understand it, but I always felt I was on the verge of understanding it."

Prof. S. Jones, geneticist, "I don't understand 'A Brief History' and I've read it several times." He believes it's success relates to the claim- "arrogant and extraordinary- contained in the last line: 'For then we would know the mind of God.' Jones says: "That is completely ludicrous. Like Darwin's 'Origin of the Species', which sold out within a few weeks, the book promises to answer the big question, but only ends up showing people the depth of their ignorance."

Sir Michael Atiyah, President of the Royal Society, believes the public "...assumes that the book is fact. Actually, a large section is inevitably Hawking's opinion. Readers, he says, may not have picked this up." 27 April '95

COMMENT: "For, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Romans 1:22.

"And he called the light Day..." Gen.1:5

"I am the light of the world. He that followeth me walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8:12

DAYLIGHT

- **IS** a voluntary lay educational initiative for a Catholic creation-science society, being funded by subscriptions, donations and sales of publications.
- **CONTINUES** the work of the former 'Counter-Evolution Group', and its publication 'DAYLIGHT', founded in 1977 by the late John Campbell, who died in 1986. R.I.P.
- **UPHOLDS** the traditional doctrines of the Catholic Church relating to Creation, Scripture, the nature of Man, and the status of Science, as taught by e.g.
Councils (4th Lateran [1215], Trent [1546], Vatican I [1870] ;
Encyclicals ("Providentissimus Deus" [1893] Leo XIII, "Pascendi dominici gregis" [1907] St.Pius X, "Spiritus Paraclitus" [1920] Benedict XV, "Humani generis" [1950] Pius XII.)
- **PROMOTES** links with other Catholic groups that support its aims, e.g. "Catholic Origins Society of America".
- **RECEIVES** information from leading Creation Science organisations, e.g. 'Creation Science Movement', 'Institute for Creation Research' [USA], 'Creation Science Foundation' [Australia].
- **ARRANGES** public and private lectures and meetings.
- **PUBLISHES** and distributes a quarterly magazine -DAYLIGHT to over 200 people in 16 countries world-wide.
- **PROVIDES** a mail-order service of books, literature, tapes and videos, and an advice service for information and resources.
- **WELCOMES** new supporters from the Hierarchy, Clergy, Religious, Scientists, Doctors, Scholars, Teachers, Students and Layfolk.